

REMARKS

Claims 1-16, 18-48, 50-53, 55, 56 are presented for prosecution. No claim is amended. Claims 17, 49 and 54 were previously cancelled.

Claims 6-16, 19-32, 38-48 and 51-53 are allowed. Applicants thank the Examiner for allowance of these claims.

The current Office Action states that Applicant's remarks accompanying the amendment filed September 15th, 2005 were previously addressed in the Advisory Action filed October 26th, 2005, and the reasoning put forth in the Advisory Action are repeated in the current Office Action. The Office Action also states that by asserting that the term "factor" means "multiple", Applicants are trying to interpret the Benati et al. reference in a manner contrary to that known in the art.

Applicants respectfully point out that the above-mentioned amendment made two points that have not been addressed.

First, the above-mentioned amendment provided: (1) dictionary definitions of the term "factor" and "scale factor" that equate the term "factor" to the term "multiple"; (2) several examples where Benati et al. themselves equated the term "factor" with the "multiple"; (3) mathematical examples provided by Benati et al. in which they multiply elements by their scale factor to achieve a desired increase or reduction. Thus, Applicants assert that Applicants are not attempting to apply a meaning to the term "factor" that is contrary to that known in the art, but are instead merely pointing out the accepted meaning for the term as known in the art and evidenced by the dictionary definitions and Benati et al.'s own explanations. Applicants kindly request that the Examiner explain why the dictionary definition previously provided are not applicable to the current case, and explain how Benati et al. repeatedly erred in their explanation of their invention when they repeatedly equated the term "factor" with a the term multiple.

Secondly, Applicants noted that even if one were to accept the Office Action's stance that the term "factor" means a percentage reduction, one still does not achieve the current invention. That is, Benati et al. explain that the redeye region is the brightest region due to it being produced by a camera's flash

bulb (col. 8, line 66 to col. 9, line 1). If one were to accept the Office Action's interpretation that the redeye regions is reduced in brightness by 35% and the surrounding region (which is much dimmer than the redeye region) is reduced by 15%, it is still very likely that the redeye region will remain brighter than the surrounding region even after their respective reduction in brightness. In other words, these reductions do not teach, or suggest, that after the brightness reduction, the bordering pixels will necessarily have a brightness intensity higher than the redeye pixels, as noted in claim 1. Rather, the above cited reduction percentages would merely require that both regions be darkened by different amounts, but would not limit one specific region to necessarily being darker than the other region after the darkening sequence.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing remarks.

Respectfully submitted,



Rosalio Haro

Registration No. 42,633

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: March 10, 2006